Re: Discrete and Diffuse

From: Eric Borton <eric.borton@uc.edu>

Eric Borton to: Benson.Bob 09/02/2010 09:44 AM

To: Cc: "Lockey, James (lockeyje)" <lockeyje@UCMAIL.UC.EDU>, "Hilbert, Timothy (hilbertj)" <hILBERTJ@UCMAIL.UC.EDU> In re-reading the EPA response again, I wanted to make sure everything was clear. In the last spread sheet, you will notice there is no with a discrete AND diffuse. They are either classified as either discrete or diffuse. So by default, there will not be an instance where someone will have discrete, diffuse and interstitial. They will fall into one of the following categories: discrete pleural (n=64) diffuse pleural (n=10)discrete and interstitial (n=4)diffuse and interstitial (n=2)Total Pleural Cases = 64 + 10 + 4 + 2 = 80interstitial only = 2Total Interstitial Cases = 4 + 2 + 2 = 8I think the confusion may arise in the word "both" in the Roh 2008 paper. "6 had both pleural thickening (4 localized and 2 diffuse) with interstitial changes." I think omitting the word "both" may be more clear. > On 9/1/2010 5:22 PM, Benson.Bob@epamail.epa.gov wrote: >> I think I got it now. I have been misinterpreting the original >> spreadsheet for 3 years. >> I need a spreadsheet that matches the wording you quoted from the Rohs >> paper. >>

```
>> If a person had a discrete pleural change, the row should have
a 1. If
>> the person had a discrete pleural change and a diffuse pleural
>> both rows have a 1. If a person had all three effects, all 3
rows have
>> a 1.
>>
>> The discrete column should total 68; the diffuse column should
total 12;
>> and the interstitial column should total 8 using all 280 people.
>> I am out of the office for the rest of the week. I will return
>> Tuesday, Sept 7.
>>
>>
>>
>> From: Eric Borton<eric.borton@uc.edu>
>> To:
        Bob Benson/R8/USEPA/US@EPA
>> Cc:
         "Lockey, James (lockeyje)"<lockeyje@UCMAIL.UC.EDU>,
>>
                 "Hilbert, Timothy
(hilbertj) "<HILBERTJ@UCMAIL.UC.EDU>
>> Date: 09/01/2010 01:31 PM
>> Subject: Re: Discrete and Diffuse
>>
>>
>>
>>
>> There were 80 participants with pleural changes but not
necessarily all
>> discrete.
>>
>> The Rohs 2008 paper states, "Of the participants with pleural
>> 64 had localized pleural thickening only, 10 had diffuse pleural
>> thickening only, and 6 had both pleural thickening (4 localized
>> diffuse) with interstitial changes."
>>
      From the statement it is clear there are 68 (64+4) localized
>>
(discrete)
>>
>> cases and 12 (10+2) diffuse cases. The original spread sheets
dated
```

```
>> 7/8/2007, which you sent to me, has a column that reads "Pleural
Cases"
>> which does equal 80. There is no column that says "Discrete
Pleural".
>>
>> A "Discrete Pleural" column was introduced in the latest
spreadsheet
>> since it was requested to add the word "Discrete" to the column
>> said "Pleural Cases". This reduced the number in the original
"Pleural
>> Case" column from 80 to 68 since "Discrete Pleural" is not the
>> "Pleural Cases". Again, in the latest spread sheet, the number
>> "Discrete Cases" plus the number of "Diffuse Cases" does equal
80.
>>
>>
>>
>> On 9/1/2010 1:26 PM, Benson.Bob@epamail.epa.gov wrote:
>>> It was my understanding from previous conversations with Jim
that an
>>> individual could have both discrete and diffuse pleural
thickening.
>>> Hence, I believe the original spread sheets are correct.
Discrete
>>> pleural = 80 and diffuse pleural = 12. We need to clarify.
>>>
>>>
>>
>> .
>>
> .
```